NEW MEMBER.

Rajyasevanirata Dr. M. K. Gopala Pillai (*Director of Public Health*) took the oath and signed the rolls.

PRESIDENT: I told the honourable members of this House that I would say something about the constitutional position of states, but I do not propose to say anything at great length on the topic. I have directed that two papers be placed on the table. One paper represents the opinion expressed by me both personally and on behalf of this Government to the British Commonwealth Conference to which I was invited as a member. I could not attend the British Commonwealth Conference because of the anticipated visit of His Excellency the Viceroy. I have however forwarded to London my memorandum on the future of the British Commonwealth as that impinges on the position of India in relation to the Commonwealth. I consider that this paper should be made available to the members of this House.

The other document that will be placed in the hands of members is with regard to the Treaty Rights of Indian States. That was a speech delivered by me at the inaugural meeting of the Bombay branch of the Indian Council of World Affairs, which indicates the policy which this Government will pursue in relation to the future of Indian States. Summarising the paper it comes to this. The Travancore Government will be glad to join with other units on a proper basis so as to bring about a constitution in which a central Government will function effectively to conduct and harmonise the activities of the units. Such a central authority will be the directing force of the whole of the Indian Government. This Government is wholly against any partitioning of India from any point of view, into various parts, big or small. This Government have also expressed the view that Indian States should maintain administrative, economic, judicial and other standards as high as in any Province. I have in fact taken the line that constituting a survival of ancient Indian sovereignty, it should be possible for Indian States to be governed more efficiently than Provinces. Finally with regard to the future constitutional development within the State, it has been made clear that this Government have not committed themselves to the specific type represented by responsible Government in the Westminister or British Parliamentary sense. I also wish to make it clear that until the question of the administrative and political relations between the British Government and British India are completely settled, the future of the constitution of Indian States cannot be usefully dealt with, inasmuch as the question of the survival or non-survival of paramountcy as well as the question of the mutual relationship between British India and Indian India and between Indian India and the British Government will have to be defined beforehand. Obviously, there cannot be dual paramountcy. Paramountcy in fact cannot coexist with any system of Federation or with the Cripps scheme. The constitution of the Indian States can be effectively and logically framed only after their status vis-a-vis the other units and the centre is decided upon.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly